S.B.CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION NO.3915/2006

Date : 07.09.2006

HON'BLE MR. SATYA PRAKASH PATHAK, J.

Mr. C.S. Rajpurohit for the applicant.
Mr. Vishnu Kachhawaha, Public Prosecutor for State.

I have heard learned counsel for the applicant as well as the learned Public Prosecutor for the State and carefully gone through the impugned order.

The contention of learned counsel for the applicant is that the applicant has been involved in this case falsely and infact he is not responsible for theft of wires and on account of enmity, he has been involved in this case.

On the other hand, learned Public Prosecutor submits that the applicant was recipient of theft property. According to learned Public Prosecutor, the property is worth lacs of rupees and has been purchased by the applicant for a sum of Rs.12,000/-.

Taking into consideration the overall facts and circumstances of the present case and the fact that matter is pending investigation, I do not find it to be a fit case to extend benefit of anticipatory bail to the applicant. Accordingly, the bail application moved by the applicant under Section 438 Cr.P.C. is rejected.

(SATYA PRAKASH PATHAK), J.